COLUMBIA LIBRARIES OFFSITE
AVERY FINE ARTS RESTRICTED
AR01520938

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Edwin Friedman

Date: November 16, 1965

From: Sarah K. Fox

Subject: Sites for Expanding Facilities: Board of Higher Education

---

Dr. Gustave G. Rosenberg, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, has submitted to the City Planning Commission for preliminary reaction a list of sites to accommodate new or expanding facilities of the City University system. The sites will provide space for eight separate institutions of the system, ranging in type over the entire broad program of the BHE, from the two-year technologically oriented New York City Community College to the Ph.D-granting Graduate Center.

I. INTRODUCTION

The type of academic program offered in any of these institutions has profound implications for physical development standards and locational requirements. It becomes necessary, therefore, in evaluating some of the suggested sites, to deal with a number of factors which are seemingly unrelated to site problems:

1. The nature of the program proposed to be offered in the new facility,
2. The client group for which this program has been designed,
3. The projected population of that client group and the portion of that number which the new facility is expected to accommodate,*
4. The administrative framework within which the BHE operates, and the relationship of this framework to the development of new programs.

---

* In the majority of the cases dealt with in this report BHE Master Plan projections have been utilized. While the staff review of these projections has been critical in terms of methodology and assumptions, it was not suggested that the Board had overestimated the need. In fact, a comparison of the 1964 projections made by BHE with actual enrollments in 1965 shows either unusual accuracy or underestimation.

HT
169
.N5
M46
1965g

AVERY ARCHITECTURAL AND FINE ARTS LIBRARY
GIFT OF SEYMOUR B. DURST OLD YORK LIBRARY

In addition to these programmatic considerations, the attached discussions of each of the proposed sites are based on factors more directly related to the particular site:

1. floor space standards for various types of institutions of higher learning,
2. Land acquisition costs and site development costs,
3. Priorities and the relationship of BHE's performance capability to capital budgeting and programming.

II. THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S CURRENT PLANNING PROBLEMS

A. Inadequate Floor Area Standards

As will be seen from the individual site evaluations, gross floor area standards in use by the individual institutions range from a low of 60 sq. ft. per student to a high of 190. The range is not based, as might be expected, on a minimal acceptable floor area requirement per student, with a factor added to meet the varying space needs of different types of programs (e.g., laboratory facilities for science programs, studios for work-study programs). Officials of the BHE are unable to explain satisfactorily the methods used in arriving at floor area requirements. Continuing discussions with them are required in order to evolve a logical and realistic standard which is flexible enough to accommodate diverse types of institutions.

To indicate the scope of the difficulty, the Master Plan for New Facilities (1965 Amendments) proposes an addition of 72,318,670 sq. ft. of gross floor area which will increase total capacity of the system by 32,250 full-time day session matriculant students. By their figures, the building program will result, therefore, in a gross floor standard

AVERY ARCHITECTURAL AND FINE ARTS LIBRARY
GIFT OF SEYMOUR B. DURST OLD YORK LIBRARY

of over 2,000 sq. ft. per student. A careful exploration of meaningful standards is obviously called for.

For information on floor area standards, New York University was selected as the institution most nearly comparable to the City University system in terms of operating in a congested urban area where land costs are high. The Chief of their campus planning department states that he uses a standard of 150 sq. ft. per student with an added factor for program requirements and considers this standard so minimal as to be useful only where existing conditions make no other solution possible.

B. Undermined Relationship of Enrollment Figures to Floor Area Requirements

All BHE enrollment projection figures cover only full-time day session students. However, each plant must be large enough to accommodate evening students as well, particularly in those institutions, like Baruch School, in which the program is heavily weighted toward the needs of working students. Projections and capacity figures do not deal with part-time day students either and yet they form an ever increasing segment of the college population. Wherever possible this report will make an effort to judge the adequacy of facilities on the basis of BHE figures combined with an added factor for part-time students.

While the BHE Master Plan uses the number of full-time day session students for citing capacity and making projections, it uses the total enrollment figure to support capital budget requests. A consistent standard of computation is called for.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/memorandumabouts00unse

C. Optimum Size

The BHE should be encouraged to assess each of its institutions in terms of the limit beyond which it cannot expand without causing harm to its educational goals. A reading of the Master Plan and the Capital Budget requests appears to indicate that limit is set only by the availability or lack of space for expansion. A well-defined approach to this problem, from the educators' point of view, would assist the planning arm of the Board in determining when a given institution has reached its optimum size and when and where new institutions will be required.

D. Enrollment Pressures

Those City, State and Federal agencies responsible for higher educational institutions are justifiably concerned over the enormous increase in college enrollments which is already with us and with the alarming increase which is projected for the near future. The scope of this increase and the inability of existing institutions to handle it have been carefully documented and as a result both State and Federal programs base their allocations of grants to institutions of higher learning on a complex formula overwhelmingly weighted toward expansion programs which will increase significantly the capacity of a given institution. For instance, under existing programs an institution which proposes the construction of a library cannot qualify for governmental aid since that library will not increase enrollment capacity. Parenthetically, it should be noted that this aid procedure has important implications for the quality of the academic programs being offered.

The 1964 Master Plan of the BHE, the State University Master Plan and the Federal and State grant reports present startling statistics on need and conclude that we must build and build fast. A number of factors are contributing to this picture:

1. The percentage of high school graduates who apply for college admission is greater than ever before and is expected to increase more rapidly as a result of the change in commerce and industry's employee requirements and the widespread change in economic and social standards.
2. Our total population is increasing, but college-age population is increasing even more rapidly.
3. There has been in the past a significant tendency for New York students to attend out-of-State institutions, but these opportunities are being slowly foreclosed as other States are forced to deal with their own enrollment pressures.

E. The Absence of Locational Criteria

Because of the immediacy of the enrollment problem, educational planners have not dealt with the establishment of criteria for the location of those facilities designed to ease the pressure. For instance, the BHE Master Plan offers much valuable information and provides guidelines for many phases of program development but does not deal with locational issues per se. Chapter 4, "Plans for New Facilities," outlines 45 capital projects to be completed by 1972, but there is no mention of the principles to be used in location of new facilities. The selection of sites has become a matter of finding a chink in the City structure and slipping into it.

Recognizing that the evaluation of each of these sites is being made in the absence of clearly stated locational principles, it is nonetheless apparent that the placement of these institutions can have a profound effect on the City structure and can give positive direction to the communities or areas in which they will be eventually located. The Commission's involvement in the site selection process can foster the utilization of these facilities to further community growth and change, to maximize the utilization of transportation facilities, to give focus to poorly defined areas, to bring a measure of urbanity and culture to sections of New York City which might just as well be anywhere else and to serve that portion of the population most needful of its services.

A valuable beginning to the development of locational criteria can be found in the City Planning Department staff report of January 15, 1964 on the location of Kingsborough Community College. Principles for the location of the full range of programs offered by the BHE should be part of a separate study and must be incorporated within the comprehensive plan presently being developed for New York City.

III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Baruch School of Business Administration has presented ample documentation of the severe inadequacy of its present quarters, even for the processing of its 1965 enrollment, much less for any anticipated increase. BHE has proposed two solutions: 1) a new facility on the site adjacent to Police Headquarters in the Civic Center, 2) expansion of the present quarters onto the site now occupied by the Family Court. Since both have size limitations, it is imperative that the BHE spell out Baruch's floor area needs with precision before agreement on either

of these sites can be given. A new structure which will be inadequate a year after its dedication is not a solution. The Family Court site will not be available for six years at the very least, and because of its shape and neighbors, presents serious design problems. Should the Civic Center site prove adequate in terms of providing sufficient floor area, Baruch's acquisition of the site would be suitable from a number of vantage points: as a complement to the Civic Center; as a means of obtaining multiple advantages from proposed Civic Center facilities; as an opening for more intensive cooperation between governmental and academic functions; as a means of meeting the need for part-time evening faculty enlisted from the nearby Wall Street and Civic Center Districts; as a method of meeting the transportation requirement of the bulk of the student body.

2. Manhattan Community College is seeking a permanent site to accommodate a projected doubling of enrollment by 1970. The unique nature of its work-study program makes a central location imperative. It is a competitor for the Civic Center site and has also proposed the use of P.S. 69 on 54 Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues. The latter is inadvisable in terms of size and the Civic Center site would be more suitable to the needs of the Baruch School. Capital Budget request for a $50,000 permanent site study may be premature in view of the experimental nature of the program. A possibility for future location of this school is the Washington Market which would afford direct linkage to the CBD and Wall Street District, a suitably sized site, and a base for future development of the area.

3. City College: Uptown Campus, College Commons The College Commons is an element of the City College Master Plan for redevelopment of its central campus. It is the only element of the construction program which requires land acquisition--a half block containing old law tenements listed as deteriorating by the U.S. Census of Housing. Because this half block is an integral and contiguous portion of the redevelopment site a Commons here cannot be considered independently from the rest of the redevelopment plan. The total redevelopment plan presents a number of serious design problems which merit rethinking before an agreement is made to the acquisition of the Commons site.

4. Hunter College: Midtown Campus. Severe overcrowding and the pressures of constantly increasing enrollments are sufficient cause to merit expansion onto the nearby Lexington School for the Deaf, even though the land valuation is very high - $40.00 per square foot. Even with full development of this site, Hunter will not have sufficient space to handle expected enrollments and its gross floor area per student standard will remain well below minimal standards. The BHE should consider ways of reducing enrollments to reach an optimum operating size. This may be accomplished in many ways, either by raising academic standards for acceptance or shifting the graduate program to a separate institution.

5. Hunter College, Bronx Campus: Fine Arts Building. While the need for this new component of the Bronx campus is genuine, its location on the proposed air rights site of the Bronx Community College raises serious questions concerning the latter. It is felt that this location for the community college is inappropriate and does not meet the needs of the Borough of The Bronx and that the high platforming costs which would be incurred at this location are extremely inadvisable.

6. Graduate Division. Now a small institution, the Graduate Center is expected to grow as a result of internal BHE pressures. This growth should be encouraged as a means to further the vital goal of decentralization and the reduction of student bodies in existing senior colleges. Two sites would serve anticipated Graduate Center needs for a fully developed modern campus containing a variety of facilities and would, if accepted by the BHE, benefit the City by giving a push to development in areas of concern: Welfare Island or the proposed "Heartlands" Civic Center on Staten Island.

7. New York City Community College. This is a complicated institution, utilizing a variety of facilities and offering a number of different types of programs for students at varying levels of achievement. The new Academic and Science Building, now under construction, will almost double existing floor space. In addition they wish to alter the interior of their main plant on Jay Street and rehabilitate the Jay Street Annex, which they recently obtained from the Federal Government. If approved, their combined facilities will yield a gross floor area standard larger than that of any other institution in the system. In the interests of maintaining this institution for use by those segments of the population best able to benefit from its unique mass transit accessibility, this college should be urged to release its transfer students to the Kingsborough Community Colleges, which are or will be more centrally located within the borough of Brooklyn, and concentrate within the New York City Community College those programs, both existing and proposed, which will obtain its student body from areas of underachievement scattered throughout the City.

8. Richmond College. BHE is requesting a site for a new type of institution on Staten Island, one which will offer only the third and fourth years of baccalaureate study. It will therefore be able to accommodate only transfer students from community colleges on the Island and in Brooklyn. While this proposal can relieve serious enrollment pressures in Brooklyn College, it will shortchange the ever-increasing number of Staten Island high school graduates who are able to meet the standards required for direct enrollment into a senior college. The positive effects of decentralization will be offset by the movement of Staten Island students to Brooklyn. A site large enough to encompass a Richmond Senior College plus transfer students from community colleges is therefore required. The Heartlands district or the City-owned parcels in Dongan Hills adjacent to the Staten Island Community College, now under construction, should be considered.

1. BARUCH SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Present Quarters

Block Boundaries: Lexington Avenue, 23 Street, Third Avenue, 22 Street

Lot Area: 31,900 sq. ft.

Gross Floor Area: 420,400 sq. ft.

Gross Floor Area Per Student: 75 sq. ft.*

Assessed Valuation: Land $885,000; Land per sq. ft. $22.50;

Land and Improvements $3,400,000

Enrollment*

Spring 1965: 5,570

1970 Projection: 6,721

Increase: 18%

Suggested Sites

a. Civic Center

Block Boundaries: Madison Street, Pearl Street, New Street

Lot Area: 107,167 sq. ft. (maximum)

b. Expansion of existing facilities to include Family Court south of present quarters.

Increase in Lot Area: 7,500 sq. ft.

Assessed Valuation: Land $240,000; Land and Improvements $400,000;

Land per sq. ft. $32.00

Site Standards

Requirements for BBE: Gross Floor Area, 330,000 sq. ft.;

Lot Area, 2 1/2 acres. (These requirements reflect poor estimation techniques.)

Gross Floor Area Per Student: Approximately 50 sq. ft.*

---

* Computed on the basis of all of the day students and half of the part-time non-matriculating students.

Establishment of Need

The Baruch School of Business and Public Administration outgrew its present quarters a number of years ago and has been "making do" under considerable strain. Built in 1928 to a height of eight stories, an additional eight were grafted on, which added only 64,000 sq. ft. of usable space to the building, and the vertical expansion led to the eradication of a large amount of the original usable floor space. This accounts, in part, for the apparent contradiction between the floor space now available to them (420,400 sq. ft.) and the floor area which they are requesting (730,000 sq. ft.). The internal inefficiency of vertical transportation in structures devoted to academic use should not be underestimated. The original site was expanded to include the old Children's Court Building adjoining their main building, and is now used as a Student Center. Enrollment pressures and insufficient space have made it necessary for the School to rent 80 classrooms in nearby institutions.

In establishing priorities among the many projects considered essential by the BHE, it should be borne in mind that a new site and structure for the Baruch School, as submitted, will not add to the School's capacity and may not even serve to relieve sufficiently existing serious conditions of overcrowding. With this in mind, the standards by which the Baruch School determines its gross floor area needs must be reviewed with great care. The Dean responsible for administering the physical plant estimates that gross floor area requirements in a new structure must be calculated at upwards of 500,000 sq. ft., a figure which, while more realistic than the estimate of the Cottrell Report,* will provide a floor area standard of only 80 sq. ft. per student.

---

* 330,000 sq. ft.

The BHE Master Plan does not contemplate an increase in enrollment by 1970. This does not indicate that the School has reached its saturation point but rather that projection for a specialized school of the Baruch type is extraordinarily difficult. On the basis of our knowledge of the impending growth in demand in all institutions of higher learning it can be safely assumed that this phenomenon will be repeated within the Baruch School and should be taken into consideration when determining floor area standards.

Academic Program and Locational Implications

The School offers a liberal arts program with a major in business administration leading to the baccalaureate degree and a master's degree in Business Administration and Public Administration. (In addition, it operates the College of Police Science, located at the Police Academy. This program is a minor area of responsibility and does not enter into our calculations in any way.) It is the only institution within the City system which offers this program. Its students are, therefore, residents of all the boroughs and a linkage of this institution with the major transportation network is imperative. The program requires a large ancillary faculty of specialists, many of whom work in the Wall Street and Civic Center areas. This portion of the faculty regard teaching as a source of pleasure and stimulation primarily, and do not rely upon it for a significant portion of their income. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the administration to seek to retain the services of these specialists by easing as much as possible the additional pressures which teaching may entail. A short travel time for part-time faculty remains a prime consideration, perhaps more so for a school of this type than for any of the other schools within the system, where faculty needs are qualitatively different. The students, as well, come from the same general area. Only 4,000 of a total student body of 10,920 are full-time day students.

The rest are part-time matriculating or non-matriculating students. It is assumed that the bulk of these are presently employed in fields related to the academic program and must minimize the travel time between place of business and school. A study made in 1964* indicates that 69 percent of the student body work below 80 Street in Manhattan although only 18 percent reside in the entire borough of Manhattan.

Site Analysis

The Civic Center Site has much to recommend it. First, in terms of the total Civic Center itself, the inclusion of a college on its periphery would add a new element to what might otherwise become an ingrown complex with few opportunities to exert influence on and be influenced by other types of institutions. As a complement to the Civic Center it might add variety in what now promises to be an overwhelming centralization of bureaucratic functions. Second, this School, with its disproportionate emphasis on evening programs, would give the area life in after-office hours. The uses presently proposed for the Civic Center are almost exclusively 9 to 5. A college sited here would increase the efficiency and utility of existing uses in the off-hours. Third, the program offered by this branch of City University is particularly well suited for inclusion in the Civic Center. It draws its faculty from the immediate and nearby areas, and much of its student body. Hopefully, the proximity of the academic and the governmental functions can serve to sharpen the insights of both. Fourth, this parcel lies on the periphery of the Civic Center, immediately north of the approaches to the Brooklyn Bridge and just west of a residential community. The university can serve as an integrating link between the two. Fifth, the parking facilities being planned for the Civic Center

---

* For presentation to the Site Selection Board in connection with a request for the 26 Street Armory as a relocation site for Baruch School.

can be put to use in the evening hours as well. The public transportation picture with relation to this site is by no means ideal, but it is well served by existing bus lines and two express stops lie within approximately 800 ft.

At various times the site has been proposed for uses either directly related to the residential community to the west or to the Civic Center: restaurants, parking facilities, a home for the World's Fair model of the City, a hotel or motel, housing, a shopping center, a theatre, a playlot for Little Leaguers, a pedestrian mall to attract workers during lunch time. An auditorium for rained-out public events appears in the list as well, and nowhere in existing plans for the Center has space been allocated to this use. Conceivably, any auditorium in the college could serve both the needs of the Civic Center and of the School.

The drawbacks, however, may be serious. A maximum lot area of 107,000 sq. ft. can be carved out of this site only if Madison Street is closed. Since plans for the adjoining Police Headquarters site and the street pattern for this portion of Lower Manhattan are still in the formative stages, it is impossible to assess realistically the space that will be available for development. Under the best conditions and given that 550,000 sq. ft. will satisfy existing and projected needs (which has by no means been established), the Baruch School can theoretically be accommodated on this site in a 6-story building with 100 percent lot coverage.

But plans to retain Madison Street as a direct bus link between the Lower East Side residential communities and the Financial district are being given serious consideration. If Madison Street is not closed the site will be reduced to approximately 84,000 sq. ft. which may not be entirely adequate. Again, final assessment of actual site size available and the traffic pattern and its implications for a sizable generator like the college must await the outcome of ongoing

studies and discussions. In discussing the Civic Center site for any use it should be borne in mind that one of the peculiarities of the site is the impossibility of expansion. Determination of space needs for Baruch School must, therefore, be even more carefully evaluated than for other institutions of the BHE system.

The second alternative, that of expanding onto the parcels adjoining the existing site, appears at first glance to be a reasonable suggestion. One of its major drawbacks is timing. At best, the Family Court will not be ready for demolition for six years, when the proposal to centralize all court functions may be ready to proceed. With the acquisition of this parcel, the outmoded --story Student Center can be demolished and a site of 15,000 sq. ft. assembled for expansion. This site must yield at least 136,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area to reach the minimal standard of 550,000 sq. ft. It is theoretically possible to achieve needed floor space on this site in a structure approximately 9 stories high, but again there is the problem of loss of floor space to vertical transportation and full coverage of the site may be undesirable in terms of design.

Although a site for the Baruch School was listed by Chairman Rosenberg as the most "urgent" site need" and the pressures noted by the School administrators are intense, we should bear in mind that this element of the University expansion program is not on the top of the priority list--it will not expand the School's capacity to accommodate more students. The acquisition of sites and funds for construction are more pressing for other projects of the system, i.e., the Community Colleges, which can serve to further major City-wide policies of an urgent nature. This is recognized by the BHE as well: Their submission for the 1966-67 Capital Budget places this project as number 46 out of the 49 submitted. It is therefore advisable to take the time at this point to plan for a site which is truly adequate to the needs of the institution.

It has been suggested that the movement of the Baruch School to a new location would enable the Borough of Manhattan Community College to acquire the old structure as a permanent home, with no additional capital outlay. However, this would be only a temporary expedient, given the projected needs of the Community College and the inadequacies of the structure. Eventual construction costs of a new plant for the Community College would be offset by the sale of this prime property and by the internal benefits to be derived from efficiently designed space geared to the needs of the very special program of the Community College

2 BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Present Quarters

Rented space at 134 West 51 Street

Gross Floor Area: 75,300 sq. ft.

Floor Area per Student: 83 sq. ft.

Enrollment

Spring 1965: 900 day students; 310 evening; 1,210 total

Goal, 1970. 4,200 in new quarters or 2,200 in rented quarters

Increase: 48 percent

Suggested Sites

A. Civic Center (See page 11 for details of site)

B. Public School 69

Block Boundaries: Sixth Avenue, 54 Street, Seventh Avenue, 55 Street

Lot Area: Approximately 30,000 sq. ft.

Assessed Valuation: Land $700,000; Land and Improvements $750,000; Land per sq. ft. $23.00

Board of Higher Education Site Standards

Gross Floor Area: 625,000 sq. ft.

Floor Area per Student. 150 sq. ft

Establishment or Need

The Borough of Manhattan Community College was established in 1964. Two floors in a new office building just off Rockefeller Center have been rented at a yearly cost of $388,398, or $5 00 per sq. ft. Its student body is small and the need for a site is predicated on enrollment projections. These are based on an intake of 15% of the projected number of qualified high school graduates. Projections have been made on the basis of City-wide figures, not broken down by borough, and an increase from 5,000 community college day students in 1963 to 20,000 by 1970

is anticipated for the City as a whole. Distribution of this increase in enrollment has been planned among the community colleges now in operation in each of the boroughs with the proportion to be taken by each borough determined on the basis of the number of high school graduates within the borough. It is claimed that the number projected in rented quarters would not meet the needs of the borough. High rental costs preclude the possibility of expanding enrollment within the present structure.

It should be pointed out to the Board that projections for this branch of the community college system are extremely difficult to make and must be viewed by the Planning Commission with caution. Because the work-study program offered at Manhattan Community College is entirely different from the programs of the other community colleges it will draw its student body from all five boroughs. Only 15% of the present student body is enrolled in the traditional community college liberal arts programs, for which the borough of Manhattan itself can be considered a justifiable base for projections. In the final analysis, ultimate enrollment will depend more on the success of the program than on sophisticated projection techniques.

Academic Program and Locational Implications

The Borough of Manhattan Community College offers a program unique in the City University system. Begun as an experiment, it has already reached the enrollment figure projected for 1967 in rented quarters. The bulk of the student body (85%) is involved in a work-study program leading to an AA or AS degree. Students work half-time in jobs related to the academic program and go to school for the rest of the day. Thirteen fields of commercial specialization will eventually be offered at the school. Jobs are provided with corporations cooperating with the school. These corporations are all in the Central Business District or in the Wall Street Area. Students can allow about 1 hour for transit and lunch between

work and school, school and work. Location within or in very close proximity to job areas is therefore essential. At one time the Baruch School carried on a program leading to the AA or AS degree in Business, but they are phasing out all such operations on a directive from the BHE, and the operation of the two-year business program is being concentrated in the Borough of Manhattan Community College. Because of its direct location in relation to job opportunities and to major transportation facilities and because programs of like intensity are not offered elsewhere in the City, the College's student body comes not only from Manhattan but from Queens and the Lower Bronx as well. Recruitment of students is handled directly by the College, whose job it is to interest students within the City high school system. Visibility within a residential community is not a key locational element for a school of this type.

Because of the unique nature of its program, the School has longer class sessions than any of the other colleges and operates on a trimester rather than a semester basis. In other words, the summer months are as important to the program as any of the other seasons. An air-conditioned structure is, therefore, essential.

Site Analysis

The Civic Center site, limited and uncertain as it is, is being eyed covetously by both Baruch and Borough of Manhattan. Each claims that its needs would be better served by this site. Here is yet another indication of the intensity of competition for centrally located parcels. Both institutions present valid claims to the site. Locationally, they can both benefit. Although the Borough of Manhattan has asked for more space than did Baruch, their standards are perhaps more realistic than those presented by Baruch, which, as indicated previously, are open to serious question (150 sq. ft. per student is suggested by the State Department of Higher Education.) The discrepancy between the standards used by the two institutions may arise from diverse means of computing enrollment: Borough of Manhattan uses a combined total of day and evening students, Baruch only their full-time day students.

The error is compounded by the fact that the Baruch School's evening courses have a considerably larger enrollment which uses the plant for a shorter period of time than their daytime program, whereas the converse is true of the Borough of Manhattan program, in which daytime utilization is and will continue to be much more intensive than evening. In view of Baruch's greater dependence on part-time staff gleaned directly from the Civic Center and Wall Street areas to service its huge evening program, our initial response lies in their favor. In addition, the nature of their research programs and the possibility for intensive cooperation between municipal offices and their academic counterparts further favor Baruch School at this location. However, a commitment to either should not be made until such time as a decision on Madison Street is reached. If it is ultimately determined to retain the street, the site area available to either institution will be only 83,000 sq. ft.

Site B, P.S. 69, is an underutilized school programmed for closing as part of the consolidation of administrative offices of the Board of Education. This consolidation was approved in an amendment to the 1964-65 Capital Budget which provides for an administrative annex to the Board of Education at a cost of 5 1/2 million dollars. Although the site is suitable in terms of availability and is ideal in terms of location in relation to the transportation network and the business concerns which cooperate with the School, it is totally unsuitable in terms of size. Maximum square footage to be obtained from this site, even with bonuses for plaza and arcading, is 540,000 sq. ft., or 85,000 less than the amount stated as desirable by the BHE. Further, under existing zoning regulations, the maximum floor area could only be achieved in a tower approximately 35 stories high, a completely unacceptable solution in a use of this type.

It has been suggested that if the Civic Center site should be allocated to Baruch, the Borough of Manhattan can move directly into Baruch's old quarters. The school administrators feel, however, that the present institution is a "white elephant," difficult to run and unable to meet stated floor space requirements. In addition, the importance of the summer program makes an air-conditioned institution imperative.

The Board of Higher Education has made its second formal request for capital funds for the Manhattan Community College in this year's capital budget, the first having been denied last year. This year's request is item No. 45 and the funds ($50,000) would be used for a permanent site study. A permanent site study should be undertaken as funds permit since none of the sites thus far suggested can be considered suitable. Since the planning arm of BHE has not as yet developed adequate site standards, it would be suggested to them that the development of such standards for the full range of BHE institutions be incorporated into the site study for this facility.

One possible site for immediate consideration is the Washington Street Market, which has the multiple advantages of good transit connections to both the CBD and the Financial District, a sufficient amount of space, and reduced land acquisition costs.

3. CITY COLLEGE: UPTOWN CAMPUS, COLLEGE COMMONS

Block Boundaries (Commons Only): Convent Avenue, 135 Street, Amsterdam Avenue, 136 Street

Size: 44,400 sq. ft

Assessed Valuation: Land, $200,000; Land and improvements, $466,000; Land per sq. ft. $5.83

As part of an extensive redevelopment plan for the central portion of the uptown campus of City College, the BHE would like to acquire this relatively small portion of land for use as a college commons. The site contains 192 dwelling units housing 641 people. The U.S. Census of Housing lists 189 of these units as deteriorating. In the main, they are old-law tenements with stores fronting on Amsterdam Avenue. The property is on the western half of a block already owned and operated by City College. To the north lies Lewisohn Stadium and to the south Annunciation Park.

The site for the Commons is only one element in the redevelopment plan for this section of the City College campus. Lewisohn Stadium, Jasper Oval, and the block on which this property lies are being replanned to provide additional classrooms, underground parking, a track, athletic field and review ground, the entire complex acting as a link between the north and south campus. BHE planners are fully aware of the problems of tenant relocation which this site poses but must, nonetheless, consider the entire site as a unit in order to take full advantage of its potentialities.

The entire complex, including land acquisition for the Commons portion, has been lumped together for purposes of capital budgeting. Funds for the project were approved in 1965 but have not been spent as yet.

A review of the present site request must also be based on the treatment of the entire area as a unit. Plans for the complex submitted to the Commission during the Departmental Hearings on the Capital Budget indicate that an exclusion of this patch of property from use by the College would be extremely inadvisable and would severely and unneccessarily limit the ability of BHE to make plans for redevelopment of the central campus. In view of an anticipated lengthy construction period, tenant relocation is a long-range problem and would not begin for at least 10 years (estimate of BHE's Architectural Unit).

Initial response to this request is positive, but the plans for the whole complex raise a number of planning and design questions. For instance, why has the Commons been sited on the periphery of the campus rather than in a central location? What present needs will be met by the new development and how does it relate to projected future needs? Why two athletic fields for City College when, at the same time, Brooklyn College's single field is being reduced by 40% to supply faculty with parking facilities? Can the large central open space be so designed as to integrate surrounding spaces rather than cut them off?

In view of the need to enlarge capacity throughout the City University system, what priority should be assigned to a project of this type?

Given these unresolved questions and the unspent funds allocated to this project in the 1965-66 Capital Budget, the current request for $2,010,000 should be deferred at this time.

4. HUNTER COLLEGE: MIDTOWN CAMPUS

Present Quarters

Block Boundaries: 68 Street, Park Avenue, 69 Street, Lexington Avenue

Lot Area: 81,000 sq. ft.

Gross Floor Area: 634,000 sq. ft. (exclusive of heating plant).

Floor Area Per Student: 48 sq. ft. (Computed on the basis of all the day students and the full-time equivalent ratio of 2:1 for graduate students and 3:1 for nonmatriculants.)*

Enrollment

Spring 1965: 27,990 (4,981 day students; 4,891 graduate students; 18,119 part-time nonmatriculants).

1970 Projection: 600 additional students

Site Standards

Requirements of BHE: 335,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area

Projected Floor Area per Student: Approximately 69 sq. ft.

Suggested Site

Lexington School for the Deaf

Block Boundaries: 67 Street, Park Avenue, 68 Street, Lexington Avenue

Lot Area: 31,000 sq. ft.

Assessed Valuation: Land $1,225,000; Land per sq. ft., $40.00

---

* The full-time equivalency method of computing enrollment figures is particularly useful for the development of space standards per student. It was first used by the BHE in the 1965 Amendments to the Master Plan for dealing with graduate student enrollment figures and should, in the future, be applied to undergraduate enrollment figures as well.

Hunter College has the largest general studies program enrollment within the City University system, almost double that of its closest competitor, Brooklyn College. Program has a great deal to do with it, but location even more. The students in this program use the plant on a part-time basis but their floor area needs must be computed in the evaluation of the total needs of the School, although given lesser weight than the floor area needs of full-time students. For rough estimations, our procedure has been to halve the number of graduate students and to take one-third of the General Studies students in order to arrive at a full-time equivalency figure. This weighting is extremely rough, since most of the part-time students are evening students whose use of the plant is confined to fewer hours than the eight-hour use made of the plant by the full-time day students. Even so, the existing overall floor area standard is 48 sq. ft. per student, less square footage than any of the other facilities dealt with in this report. Even the acquisition of the new site will raise the standard to only 69 sq. ft. per student, a figure which is woefully inadequate given the State's minimum standard of 150 sq. ft.

The pressure of space has forced Hunter to use a large number of classrooms in the nearby Julia Richman High School.

Funds for expansion of Hunter onto this nearby site were allocated in the 1965-66 Capital Budget, but there appear to be difficulties in the actual appropriation of these funds. Construction cannot begin until the fall of 1967, when the Lexington Avenue School will be ready to move into its new quarters in Jackson Heights, but site planning should begin as soon as possible, particularly since an agreement to share the site with the Police Department will pose substantial problems in site planning for a dual purpose.

5 HUNTER COLLEGE BRONX CAMPUS: FINE ARTS BUILDING

The Bronx Campus of Hunter College occupies a large area bounded by Kingsbridge Road, Reservoir Avenue, Goulden Avenue, and Bedford Avenue in the northwest Bronx. Since this site request is for a specialized unit outside the campus boundaries, the usual data on existing facilities and enrollment are not relevant. Hunter proposes to construct a Fine Arts Building, with a gross floor area of 135,000 sq. ft., on the site of The Bronx Community College, which is proposed to be constructed over the Jerome Avenue IRT Yards adjacent to the Hunter campus and bounded by West 205 Street, Jerome Avenue, and Navy Street.

The Community College site plan submitted by the architects shows the Fine Arts Building as an integral part of the new campus. The Fine Arts Building per se is dealt with as a single item in the Capital Budget (HN 13B), separate from the request for development of the site for The Bronx Community College (HN 139). The Bronx project will bear the full cost of platforming the yards while the sum requested for the Fine Arts Building represents construction alone. Although treated as a separate item in the Capital Budget, the site for the Fine Arts Building cannot be approved without consideration of the validity of the proposed Community College site.

Since a review of the proposed Bronx Community College site was not included as part of this problem the need for the new campus is dealt with only peripherally. The assumption is made, without further study in depth, that the documentation of need within the borough of The Bronx is valid as stated. (Their current enrollment already surpasses by 700 day students the goal set for their institution for 1968.)

Questions of need aside, two problems related to The Bronx Community College site immediately present themselves: 1) the difficulties of air rights construction and 2) appropriate location of The Bronx Community College.

The difficulties of air rights construction are well-known and our growing experience with this type of land usage has not proved that extreme caution is unwarranted. To sum up, the difficulties arise basically from a) platforming costs, and b) noise and vibration both during and after construction. (The question of conflicting uses which ordinarily arise in a project of this type is not relevant in this instance.)

Platforming costs have been estimated by BHE in their capital submission as $4,990,700 (including building supports, railroad requirements, lighting, sprinklers). The platform would create a lot area of 408,000 sq. ft., at $12.00 per sq. ft. Since by the process of air rights construction new land is being created and the costs of such newly created land are fixed, not by the variable factors which ordinarily affect land costs but by relatively non-variable construction costs, the costs of the new land must be judged in relation to the value of land similarly located. The Hunter campus, immediately adjacent to the Yards, is assessed at approximately $1.60 per sq. ft. Creating new land at a cost which does not represent value appears to be fiscally irresponsible, particularly in an area where vacant land is not at a premium and where the proposed use does not demand a specific location.

The State Division of Housing was contacted in order to obtain further knowledge of the unanticipated difficulties they encountered in construction of Concourse Village, a housing project built over railroad storage yards. They state that the key problem is delays in construction caused by conflicts be-

tween railroad operators and construction workers in terms of scheduling and use of the tracks (some of which have to be moved, thereby increasing costs) and jurisdictional disputes among the workers. Conflicts also arose between the steel workers and the concrete workers and their engineers. Similar delays in the pre-construction stage caused the BHE to abandon its plan for construction over the Long Island Rail Road yards in Brooklyn.

How much of a problem noise and vibration may cause in a given project depends upon the volume and hours of traffic generated by the railroad or subway yard, relative to the hours of utilization of the particular facility. Careful investigation should be made of this problem.

There is no relationship between Hunter and Bronx Community College which would necessitate physical proximity. To the contrary, the BHE has explicitly stated in its Master Plan the principle of administrative separation between Senior colleges and Community colleges. The only contemplated dual use of facilities between Hunter College and the Community College is one large auditorium in the Fine Arts Building.

In view of the emphasis in the Bronx Community College program on various career technologies, a location more directly related to the programs offered may be suitable. The program of the Bronx Community College is in its developmental stage and it is difficult, at this point, to spell out in detail the implications for location inherent in the academic program. However, the choice of site should be made bearing in mind that contemplated programs can be best offered in a more central location and near major transit intersections. It should be remembered that institutions of higher learning in The Bronx are now located in the western sections and growth communities and older residential

communities which, it is hoped, will utilize the community college, are not serviced at present. Our position regarding the location of community colleges was clearly stated in the staff paper prepared during the course of site selection for the Kingsborough Community College (January 15, 1964): "In a period of vast social upheaval among the City's minority population--a period also of scarcity of funds for ameliorative measures, the possibility of securing multiple advantages from every expenditure must be examined closely . . . Community upgrading, improvement of minority educational opportunities, or any other demonstrable social and economic benefit must be considered as a locational factor." These considerations have not been brought to bear on the proposed site for The Bronx Community College.

It is therefore highly inadvisable to consider this site as a permanent home for The Bronx Community College. Alternative locations must be selected and each assessed in terms of accessibility, impact on the community, availability of supportive functions, and its relationship to the highest concentration of population to be served.

6. GRADUATE DIVISION

Present Quarters: Rented space at 33 West 42 Street

Enrollment:

Spring 1965: 207

Projected, 1970: 500

Site Requirements: 100,000 sq. ft. or 200 sq. ft. per student

The Graduate Program, begun in 1961, is still in its infancy and the exact nature of its future needs remains unknown. The projected enrollment for 1970 is a figure pulled out of the air. No projections can be made until the BHE is able to resolve the question, among others, of centralization versus decentralization. The administration of the Graduate Center will undoubtedly wish to centralize as many graduate programs as possible while the individual senior colleges will wish to add to the prestige of their own institutions by instituting or retaining graduate programs of their own. This year's course catalogues reveal some of the dynamics of the conflict. The Graduate Center on 42 Street now offers all the graduate courses in Mathematics and History, two fields which require little more in the way of equipment than standard classroom space. In the coming semester it is proposed that all Economics programs leading to the Ph.D will be centralized as well. However, some of the individual colleges still offer university graduate courses in these fields as distinct from college graduate courses.

If the problem were merely one of providing classroom and office space in a central location for limited programs, space and capital needs would be relatively low and a solution relatively simple.

However, the centralization-decentralization issue may ultimately involve those graduate programs requiring large amount of space and extensive capital expenditures. The BHE is unable and probably unwilling to commit itself at this point in time to a resolution of the problem. The Master Plan of 1964 carefully sidesteps the issue:

> "A new, larger central physical facility must be developed in the next four years to supplement the facilities of the Senior Colleges as needed, and to enhance the development of the doctoral program without wasteful duplication of existing facilities. If as we expect, enrollment in the doctoral programs will triple by 1968, additional classroom, seminar, library and research facilities will have to be expanded both at the Colleges and centrally . . . With the expansion of graduate research by both students and faculty, the need for research laboratories, scientific equipment and other facilities becomes more critical. If the University is to use its best qualified faculty in its own doctoral programs, it is imperative that space and facilities be provided to attract back to our own campuses faculty who are now carrying on their research on the campuses of other universities and at local research institutes. Each of the Senior Colleges is developing plans for building new science buildings or expanding existing ones. This kind of expansion must continue."

The City Planning Commission's principal concern is also the avoidance of "wasteful duplication of existing facilities." Duplication will continue as long as the future of the Graduate Center remains unresolved. It should be borne in mind that the suggested expansion of existing research facilities on Senior College campuses is almost impossible given the stated inability of these campuses to support even anticipated increases in undergraduate enrollment. The above-quoted Master Plan statement must therefore be read as a conciliatory document for internal consumption.

While it may be necessary for the BHE to allow the passage of time to resolve the issue, from a planning point of view it is necessary to make an estimation of the probable outcome of the conflict in order to avoid the duplication of facilities which is inherent in a lengthy and unresolved conflict among the various components of the Board.

This year's capital submissions deal with the erection of a number of graduate research facilities at several of the senior colleges. No funds for the Graduate Center have been requested. But in view of the planning problems anticipated by a delay in the establishment of the Graduate Center on its own site (our estimation of the ultimate resolution of the conflict as well as, unofficially, the estimation of several of the administrators of the BHE), it is felt that a site selection program be initiated as soon as possible. The standard of 100,000 sq. ft. is of course meaningless when the Graduate Center is conceived in broader terms than those which the BHE is currently forced to use. The need to provide conference, research, classroom and office space, as well as a large amount of housing facilities* dictates a thoroughgoing restudy of space needs.

As a start, the site on Welfare Island previously suggested for the United Nations International School would be even more advantageous as a site for the Graduate Center. Access for graduate students may pose a more serious problem than access for elementary and high school students whose schedules are more routinized than are graduate students'. However, this is a soluble problem. The design concept of a traffic-free enclave with an internal transportation system first proposed for the Island by Victor Gruen may be useful in thinking about future non-residential development. This site would in no way affect the park concept originally entertained by the staff as well as a number of civic organizations, and it would give needed impetus to the original proposal.

---

*"The need for student housing and temporary quarters for younger faculty members has already been felt by the University's sister institutions in New York City. Graduate students, frequently married and with families, find available housing all but prohibitively expensive; the needs of foreign students are particularly acute. . .Offered adequate dwelling space, students and faculty can be drawn to the University from an increasingly wide geographical area. . .Plans must go ahead at once to acquire necessary land in parts of the City suitable to the University's requirements." Master Plan, 1964. Facilities for Graduate Program, p. 55.

A second site which has considerable merit has been suggested in a staff report on the development of a Civic Center for Staten Island in the Heartlands, close to the proposed Macy's. For further description of this site see the last section of this report.

No capital expenditures are presently required or will be required for the next five years at the least, but proper planning can be insured by immediate reservation of land for eventual Graduate Center use. The fact that substantial amounts of land are available at both locations suggested above insures the unconstrained development of a model compus for which detailed planning can be undertaken in an unpressurized atmosphere.

B A C K G R O U N D D A T A

Existing Plant	Lot Area (Sq.Ft.)	Gross Floor Area (Sq.Ft.)	Assessed Valuation			Enrollments* Winter 1965	Sq.Ft. Per Student
			Land	Land and Improvements	Land Per Sq.Ft.		
12 Franklin Avenue	12,000	40,000	$ 20,000	$ 260,000	$1.66	650	62
300 Pearl Street	23,625	127,500	118,000	1,600,000	4.90	2,800	46
Academic and Science Building (under construction)	60,125	360,000	263,200	-	4.20	-	-
Space in George Washington High School (auditorium and gymnasium)		9,406	-	-	-	-	-
Rented Facilities: 42 Flatbush Avenue		52,000				700	74
25 Clark Street**		82,000				200	410
Present Total		670,906				4,350	
Requested Site: Jay Street Annex	21,115	168,920	60,000	700,000	4.00	-	-
Proposed Total		665,826***	-	-	-	6,000	119

*Either day or evening enrollment figures are used, whichever is larger.
**Used for the College Discovery Program
***Addition of the Jay Street Annex eliminates the need for rented quarters.

Although several institutions of higher learning have requested the use of the Jay Street Annex (Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Long Island University), the Federal Government has committed the developed site to the New York City Community College. The BHE submitted to the Capital Budget Department on September 20 a revision of their Project HN 178, which originally dealt only with the renovation of the Pearl Street Building and which now incorporates alteration of the Jay Street Annex as well. The original request pushed immediate alteration of the Pearl Street Building; the new request delays the Pearl Street alteration in favor of the Jay Street alteration, which will cost approximately twice the original request.

The New York City Community College now operates out of three separate facilities, with a fourth under construction, as well as rented classrooms in nearby locations. The Franklin Avenue building was constructed by the Navy as a temporary wartime expedient. It is not a fire-proof structure and was intended for use only through the duration of the war. The structure yields very little in the way of usable floor space and comprises only 6 percent of the combined plant. It lies more than a mile and a half to the east of the main structure on Pearl Street, making administration extremely difficult. Its abandonment, without a suitable replacement, would hamper the ability of the New York City Community College to handle expected increases in enrollment.

The Pearl Street plant was constructed in 1920 and is considered by our Capital Budget Department and the College administrators to be in need of alteration. The block adjoining these two structures has been integrated with the existing site by the closing of Pearl Street. The new Academic and Science Building will more than double existing floor space, both owned and rented, and would, on first glance, appear to provide sufficient space for immediate needs.

Establishment of Need

However, the Master Plan Amendments of 1965 indicate an expected enrollment by 1970 of 5,100 students. Present enrollment is 4,350, or about 1,300 more than was anticipated in the same document for the current semester. We assume, therefore, that the 1970 projection is incorrect and will utilize the higher figure of 6,000 students in order to compute floor space requirements. According to the Master Plan this enrollment should be accommodated in the Science and Academic Building and a new Downtown Center. The latter should make it possible for the College to abandon its Franklin Avenue facility and its rented quarters. The present request for the Jay Street Annex would eliminate the need for a new Downtown Center. The construction of the new Science and Academic Building will provide the College with a total of 496,906 sq. ft. of floor space, excluding the Franklin Avenue site and the rented quarters, and would bring the floor area standard for this branch of the City University to only 82 sq. ft. per student. The Jay Street Annex will boost the available floor space to 665,626 sq. ft. or 119 square feet per student, which, although far short of the accepted standards, is adequate in terms of the operating standards of other branches of the City University system.

Academic Program and Locational Implications

In evaluating the desirability of utilizing the available Jay Street Annex for the New York City Community College, reference is made once again to the staff memorandum of January 15 which described the program of the New York City Community College in relation to existing and proposed branches of the Brooklyn Community College. While the major program emphasis in the New York City Community College is on technological courses leading to a two-year degree, college officials state that expanded facilities will enable them to accommodate

transfer students as well. Programs for transfer students are now being offered at two centers of the Kingsborough Community College and the possibility of further decentralization within the borough for such programs has been our continuing goal. Since the technological courses draw students from the entire borough--and from the entire City--they are best situated at the present location, near the intersection of major mass transit facilities. The transfer program of the Community College need not be immediately linked to the full network and should be so located as to draw on nearby residential communities.

The BHE should be urged to reconsider the advisability of offering both the technological program and the transfer program within the same institution. A complete separation of the two would remove the transfer students to more suitable locations within the borough, reduce New York City Community College enrollments and free space within the existing and proposed sites for new educational services which could benefit from the location of the Jay Street Annex.

Dr. Rosenberg has spoken of initiating a new program for high school dropouts which would be geared toward boosting their level of competency toward the goal of eventually enrolling in a two-year technological college. He has requested the use of one of the buildings on the World's Fair grounds for this program. Such reuse would entail enormous alteration expenditures, and the location would be completely unsuitable for the intended clientele, who would experience considerable difficulty in reaching the new institution. Mr. L. Schulman, Director of our Capital Budget Division, has suggested the use of the Jay Street Annex for this new program. Since students would be drawn from all over the City, the location of the Annex is ideal. Development programs of private as well as public institutions are turning the area into a training ground for personnel in the sciences and technologies at every level of academic competence, and the inclusion of this new program would add another level to the existing programs.

8. RICHMOND COLLEGE

The Board of Higher Education announced in June of this year plans to establish an "upper college" on Staten Island in 1967. The target date presupposes completion of the Community College campus in Sunnyside and the release of the rented quarters for the new program. An upper college is a departure from the usual sequence in the colleges of the other boroughs. Ordinarily, qualified students enter a senior college for the full four years of undergraduate work. Those with high school records which do not merit immediate entrance into a senior college may enter a community college for two years and then transfer to their borough senior college. This arrangement enables the system to maintain its high academic standards while preparing students unable to meet these standards for eventual entrance into a senior college. The announced upper college on Staten Island would offer only the third and fourth years of baccalaureate study and perhaps eventually a fifth year leading to the master's degree. From the limited amount of data available it is our feeling that the Board planners have conceived of this program as a means of alleviating overcrowding in the senior colleges of the other boroughs. These are able to handle the enrollment demands of entering freshmen students but are not physically geared to the accommodation of the transfer students fed to them via the community colleges. This is an entirely acceptable method of decentralization of facilities and shows clear understanding of the immense difficulties and costs that would accrue if existing senior colleges were to expand indefinitely, not to mention the effects on the quality of education offered. The approach is limited, however, by a seeming disregard for the needs of Staten Island residents. Under this new format, able Staten Island high school graduates would be forced to leave the borough,

presumably for Brooklyn College, thereby lessening the beneficial effects of decentralization. The City Planning Commission has been offered an opportunity to comment on this issue through the vehicle of the site selection process, and to point out to the Board of Higher Education the legitimate needs of Staten Island for its own senior college and to obtain clarification of the relationship between that college and the other senior colleges within the system.

Fortunately, this site request has been brought to our attention at a time when the agency is applying many of its resources to the developmental problems of Staten Island. A committee of the Board has been established to find suitable sites for this new facility and every effort should be made to formalize a working relationship with that committee whereby an interchange of relevant information may be effected. As a result of ongoing staff studies of Staten Island, two sites suggest themselves, both of which may suit the Board's needs and at the same time assist the Commission in establishing rational land use patterns for Staten Island as a whole. These sites may be immediately suggested to the Committee for further exploration.

A large tract of vacant City-owned land near the 35-acre community college site is available and possesses many of the same advantages: good highway access, a distinctive natural setting and sufficient room for expansion. The general area is characterized by unusual topography and the site would have to be reviewed to determine how much fairly level land is available for construction. One major drawback to the use of this site is the concentration of all higher institutional facilities in one location, thereby losing the potential benefits which may accrue to other communities on the Island.

Current staff proposals for a Civic Center in the Heartlands of Staten Island show the reservation of a large tract of land for higher education use, sufficient to provide for the needs of a senior college plus a fully developed Graduate Center (see discussion of Graduate Center needs, pg. 31). The senior college would be so planned as to allow the accommodation of transfer students siphoned to it from other borough community colleges. This proposal raises the issue of mass transit connections for Staten Island, an issue which will have to be faced no matter which site on Staten Island is selected for a decentralization plan.

According to staff projections a senior college for Staten Island would accommodate from 6,975 to 8,200 undergraduates by 1985 and would require from 62 to 77 acres. A senior college with space for transfer students and a Graduate Center could be accommodated on the site with ease.

The Civic Center proposal envisions a cultural and performing arts center planned for and servicing the needs of the academic community and the general Staten Island community. New York has witnessed in the past few decades the unplanned growth of Queens which remains, despite remedial efforts, physically unfocused and culturally barren in the midst of the plenty of New York City. Current projects designed to correct this situation will not be as fully serviceable, efficient or economical had they been undertaken prior to full development.

High density housing has been proposed in the concept plan for the Civic Center and could serve the needs of the academic community, as outlined in the BHE Master Plan. Housing designed specifically to meet these needs could forestall the residential blighting effect which our large urban campuses have tended to create.

While construction on the Heartlands site could not take place for some time in the future, the City-owned land can be reserved now in the interests of economy and the integrity of the plan.